The Mind's Eye on Personal Profiles: A Cognitive Perspective on Profile Elements that Inform Initial Trustworthiness Assessments in Virtual Project Teams

Ellen **Rusman**[1], Jan **van Bruggen**[1], Peter **Sloep**[1], Martin **Valcke**[2], Rob **Koper**[1]

[1] Open University of the Netherlands, CELSTEC, Valkenburgerweg 167, 6401 DL Heerlen, The Netherlands
[2] Ghent University, Department of Educational Studies, H. Dunantlaan 2, B9000 Ghent, Belgium

{ellen.rusman@ou.nl; janvanbruggen@ou.nl; peter.sloep@ou.nl; martin.valcke@ugent.be; rob.koper@ou.nl}

Correspondence to:
Ellen Rusman
Valkenburgerweg 168
6914 AT Heerlen
The Netherlands
Phone: + 32-(0)455762381
Fax: + 32-(0)455762800
Mail: ellen.rusman@ou.nl

The Mind's Eye on Personal Profiles: A Cognitive Perspective on Profile Elements that Inform Initial Trustworthiness Assessments in Virtual Project Teams

Abstract

Collaboration in virtual project teams heavily relies on interpersonal trust, for which perceived trustworthiness is an important determinant. This study provides insight in the information that trustors value to assess a trustee's professional trustworthiness in the initial phase of a virtual project team. We expect trustors in virtual teams to value those particular information elements that provide them with relevant cues of trust warranting properties of a trustee. We identified a list of commonly highly valued information elements to inform trustworthiness assessments (n=226). We then analysed explanations for preferences with the help of a theory-grounded coding scheme. Results show that respondents value those particular information elements that provide them with multiple cues to assess the trustworthiness of a trustee. This enables them to become aware of and assess the trustworthiness of another. Information elements that provide unique cues could not be identified. Insight in these information preferences can inform the design of artefacts, such as personal profile templates, to support acquaintanceships in the initial phase of a virtual project team.

Keywords: awareness; CSCW; groupware; trust; online identity; presence; virtual teams

1. Introduction

A positive level of interpersonal trust improves collaboration and communication (Corbitt et al., 2004; Gambetta, 1988; Jarvenpaa et al., 1998; Jarvenpaa & Leidner, 1998). In contrast, when there is a lack of trust, team members spend considerable time monitoring each other, backing-up or duplicating work, and documenting problems (Wilson et al., 2006). Although interpersonal trust is considered as both an important pre-condition as well as a result of collaboration, still little is known about how we can foster its formation.

One promising approach is to facilitate trustworthiness assessments. The perceived trustworthiness is an important factor that influences overall interpersonal trust of a trustor (person who trusts) in a trustee (the person whom one considers to trust) (Hardin, 2002), along with factors such as trust propensity, situational characteristics (e.g., perceived risk, task complexity, social control mechanisms) and trustors' mood at the time of trust formation (Castelfranchi & Falcone, 2010; Riegelsberger et al., 2004; Rousseau et al., 1998). The extent to which a trustor trusts a trustee to perform adequately in a given situation equals that trustee's perceived trustworthiness (Hardin, 2002). A trustor will continuously try to gauge the trustworthiness of an unknown trustee based on signs and signals that are available and may reveal properties of a trustee. Once these signals are considered to reveal a certain property of another, they become cues for that property (Donath, 2007). People make a 'best' guess based on signs and signals they perceive; this we call 'a first impression'.

In mediated environments, the transmission of these signs and signals is hampered or they are different (Donath, 2006, 2007), but the impression formation process remains just as important for human interaction (Lea & Spears, 1995; Liu & Ginther, 2001; Walther, 1995). Contrary to the belief that personal relationships would not develop via computer mediated communication (CMC), because less useful information would be available to form an impression ('cues-filtered-out' perspective) (Hancock & Dunham, 2001), Walther (1995, 1996) found that only the process of impression formation is delayed. He found that, given enough time, enough information about a person is revealed and relationships grow as a result. In face-to-face situations, people use various routes to acquire information: via face-to-face interaction, via inferences based on social characteristics (e.g., communities the other takes part in) and via reputational information acquired via 'word of mouth' (Riegelsberger et al., 2004). In virtual project teams that predominantly use computer-based communication (e.g., email, chat, videoconferencing) these routes are often not available or only in different

forms. Team members of virtual project teams sporadically meet in person, they often do not have a prior history of working together and they may never meet in the future (Jarvenpaa & Leidner, 1998), so the routes of 'word of mouth' and 'face-to-face' interaction are in many cases blocked. Furthermore, messages that are computer-mediated do not convey the same type of signs and signals as they would in face-to-face settings. For example humorously meant messages are often misinterpreted, due to lack of intonation or expression. Also, there is less time and opportunity for informal communication. This type of teams are reported to have most problems with interpersonal trust formation, especially in the initial phases of a project (Zolin et al., 2002, 2004).

In order to jump-start impression formation on trustworthiness in the first phases of a project one could offer team members information about their colleagues. This has been done for years by companies who organize special face-to-face team building activities, leaving the type of information exchanged up to spontaneous interaction. This approach has also infused online environments. Various artefacts have been used to stimulate the availability of personal information, such as story-telling, in a free form as well as guided by a more formal template, role-playing games, teambuilding exercises, and the facilitation of specific types of searches as approaches to meet the information need of trustors (Feng et al., 2004; Salmon, 2003). The notion that a representation of people in online environments is beneficial for their collaboration is supported from the perspective of research on social presence and awareness (Dourish & Belotti, 1992; Gutwin, & Greenberg, 1998, 1999, 2001, 2002; Kreijns, 2004; Kreijns & Kirschner, 2004), although the link with interpersonal trust formation is not often made. From their perspective, presenting identity information as a means of improving interaction enables users to answer questions like ''who is participating?" and ''who is that?" (Gutwin & Greenberg, 2002, p. 420 & 421). Like a high positive interpersonal trust level among virtual team members (Corbitt et al., 2004; Kanawattanachai & Yoo, 2005; Raes et al., 2006; Walther, 2005), the sense of being aware of others is known to be one of the mechanisms which helps to improve collaboration in a mediated setting (Gutwin & Greenberg, 1999, 2002). Various elements of awareness, such as 'presence', 'action', 'intention', 'artefact' and 'location' and different techniques to reveal information related to these elements have been identified (Gutwin & Greenberg, 2002). In this article, however, we will concentrate on the information on identity that trustors particularly value to assess a trustee's professional trustworthiness in the initial phase of a virtual project team.

In the initial phases of collaboration a 'sense of the identity of others' in the environment could be supported by making relevant signs and signals available through pre-structured communication templates (Aranda et al., 2010; Remidez et al., 2007; Ten Kate, 2009). These templates should then be designed so as to contain those information elements that provide personal information useful to assess the trustworthiness of the template owner. Examples of information elements are 'name', 'photo', 'hobbies', 'job title' and so on.

If one knew what information trustors value most to inform their trustworthiness assessments and how this relates to trustworthiness antecedents, one could provide a pre-structured template to facilitate the availability of this information (Rusman et al., 2009). However, it is still unclear what specific personal information trustors value most and why. We do know that personal information can facilitate the growth of interpersonal trust (Zolin et al., 2003; Feng et al., 2004), but we do not know what specific information supports trustworthiness assessments. First steps in the research on the significance of information elements have been made by Ten Kate (2009) and Berlanga et al. (2011). They explored in the context of social network sites (SNS) which elements of profile templates were used to present one or perceive another. Still, the information elements originally displayed in these templates were likely chosen by designers at the senders end of the computer-supported communication process and not specifically grounded in the cognitive processes at the receivers' end. Furthermore, the context of a social network site may differ from a virtual project team as their objectives are different. In addition, virtual teams have more mechanisms for social (institutional) control on the reliability of personal information displayed than SNS, as team members are embedded in existing organizations.

Recently, Aranda et al. (2010) identified profile information elements of co-workers that virtual team members considered useful to have available. Respondents were asked to rate the degree to which information elements were already known and/or useful. Based on the scores, information elements were classified in 6 categories, ranging from 'high usefulness-usually (un)known' to 'low usefulness-usually (un)known'. This results in the identification of information elements that are considered useful to be displayed in a profile of virtual team members and not yet known. However, in this study the rationale behind these preferences still remains unclear: why are especially these elements considered useful?

The selection of information elements for pre-structured templates is still a 'best guess' rather than a decision grounded in trustors' preferences and cognition. The focus of the present study is on information elements relevant to inform trustors professional trustworthiness assessments in virtual teams. When trustors

form an initial impression of trustees' trustworthiness, several factors interplay (Rusman et al., 2010). A trustor looks at the specific situation and the specific properties of a trustee, and is influenced by her mood as well as her trust disposition. To gauge whether a trustee has certain trust-warranting properties, a trustor collects information as cues for these properties. Although according to implicit personality theory people use different information elements as cues (Arnold, Cooper, & Robertson, 1998), we assume these elements overlap, that is, there are elements many people use. Furthermore, we hypothesize that trustors seek specific information that best matches their cognitive schema of trustworthiness antecedents. This schema guides their search for information that can function as cues for trust-warranting properties of a trustee. We test whether trustors value particular information elements that provide cues to determine whether someone is trustworthy. Some information elements may be valued more because they provide information for more than one antecedent. For example, one's education could address ability as well as consistency and responsibility. Also, from an economy principle, people may prefer single information elements that provide cues for multiple antecedents. Certain information elements will then have an increased 'weight' in a trustworthiness decision. However, people might also value information elements which provide 'unique' information related to a specific antecedent.

Therefore, we try to answer the following research question:

> *Do trustors value most those information elements that provide them with (relevant/multiple/unique) cues for specific trust-warranting properties?*

The answer to this question provides insight in the rationale behind information preferences, which can guide the design of profile templates as well as ice-breaking activities in both face-to-face as well as virtual teams.

2. Method

A questionnaire was used to collect data on common information element prefe-rences to inform trustworthiness assessments as well as the rationale behind these preferences. We first identified the 15 most commonly selected information elements. Based on this ranked list, we analyzed the explanations respondents

gave for their preferences with the help of a coding scheme (see Appendix A) grounded in a cognitive model of professional trustworthiness.

2.1. Participants

Data were collected among bachelor level students, enrolled in a research course in the Educational Sciences programme at the Ghent University. 226 students (mean age = 18,2 years, SD= 1,85; 93% of whom were female and 7% male.) filled out the questionnaire: 99 % of the respondents had previous experience with collaboration in a face-to-face project team, either in a (part-time) job or during their study. 95 % had previous experience with collaboration in a virtual project team. 88% of the respondents had experience with online conversations with people they had never met before. The majority of online conversations took place via text-based media only, either via chat and/or e-mail (78%) or in combination with short text messages (texting) (9%).

2.2. Instrument

The questionnaire consisted of two parts and contained open as well as closed questions in the respondents' native tongue (Dutch). The first part questioned res-pondents on the information elements they valued most to inform their trustworthiness assessments. It consisted of a brainstorm followed by a rating of elements (useful to inform their assessment/practical for collaboration) from a pre-defined list. The second part aimed to provide insight in the rationale behind these preferences. In this paper we restrict ourselves to the analysis of the second part. Here, participants selected the 10 most important information elements to inform their trustworthiness assessments from all elements obtained in the first part of the questionnaire. They were instructed to justify their choices by explaining what 'facts' they thought they could derive from an information element and why this was important to inform their trustworthiness assessments.

2.3. Procedure

The participants filled out the questionnaire after a short presentation that clarified our definition of virtual project teams and that showed some examples. The presentation also discussed the role of interpersonal trust for collaboration and the objectives of the questionnaire. At the start of the questionnaire, respondents were prompted by a scenario in which they acted as a member of a new European project, which required them to

collaborate in a virtual project team. They were told that they had to form a first impression of their team members' trustworthiness by selecting the information element that in their opinion mattered most for their trustworthiness assessments. Respondents were told that the responses to this questionnaire would be kept anonymous and that it would take about 30 minutes to complete this part of the questionnaire. Table 1 provides an example (translated) of the collected responses.

[INSERT TABLE 1 'Example response' ABOUT HERE]

2.4. Data analysis

We first identified the 15 information elements that were most commonly mentioned as highly informative for trustworthiness assessments. Secondly, all explanations linked with this top 15 were gathered and coded with the help of a coding scheme. The coding scheme was derived from a theoretical framework for interpersonal trust building in virtual teams, called TrustWorthiness ANtecedent schema (TWAN) (Rusman et al., 2010). Some categories were added to allow for explanations which were not directly related to trust building, or that were examples of antecedents of interpersonal trust or trustworthiness not yet mentioned in any of the predefined categories (see Appendix A). We coded 1) whether trustors' explanations of their information preferences match with the trust warranting properties of a trustee; 2) whether and how they adhere to the trust formation process in general or 3) whether they are not related to interpersonal trust at all. Here we report the results of the first part of the coding scheme, the complete scheme is available in Appendix A.

Each explanation was considered as a coding unit (Miles, & Huberman, 1994), multiple different codes were allowed. Two raters individually coded 10 % of the explanations with the help of the coding scheme (Neuendorf, 2002). The interrater-reliability (Cohen's Kappa) was 0.79 for the coding with the TWAN schema only and 0.73 for the coding with the complete coding scheme. According to Fleiss (1981), this can be considered a good (0.6-0.75) to excellent (> 0.75) interrater-reliability. The remaining responses were analyzed by one rater only.

Not all respondents provided explanations of their information preferences. We counted the possible-to-code explanations per information element and expressed the frequencies of 'code-use' in percentages relative to this number of explanations.

3. Results

We received 2251 open entries from 226 respondents, of which 1882 entries were genuine rankings and 369 (16%) entries could not be used as respondents did not correctly follow the instruction, and selected and described fewer than 10 information elements. In total, 106 different information elements were selected by respondents. 9 of them were not in the pre-defined list which respondents had available, but resulted from the brainstorm. Examples are 'stress immunity', 'computer skills' and 'meeting skills'. Table 2 shows an overview of the 15 most selected information elements and the number of explanations acquired for these preferences.

[INSERT TABLE 2 'The 15 most selected information elements and acquired explanations' ABOUT HERE]

Competence (40%), Commitment (26%), Responsibility (17%), Availability (12%) and Communality (7%) were the most frequently mentioned antecedents of professional trustworthiness across all explanations given with the 15 most selected information elements (percentages are expressed relative to the total number of used codes). Table 3 gives some literal example quotes of the top 3 antecedents mentioned with regard to different information elements. The first and second example also illustrate how a single explanation can be coded with more coding categories, since they contain elements of competence as well as of the route through which information was obtained.

[INSERT TABLE 3 'Example quotes' ABOUT HERE]

Respondents also mentioned various other antecedents (11%), which were not part of the trustworthiness antecedent schema, such as stubborn, enterprising, creative, flexible, respectful, independent/autonomous, enthusiastic and cheerful.

Table 4 provides an overview of the code frequencies expressed in terms of percentages calculated relative to the number of explanations obtained for each information element. Different codes per explanation were possible, which explains why sums of percentages exceed 100. The percentage indicates how often respondents mentioned one of the antecedents in the explanations for their information element preferences.

For example, if we look at the first column and row of the table, respondents refer to the antecedent 'availability' as a rationale for their preference of the information element 'personality traits/character' in 4% of the explanations provided with this information element. As the current interest is in the relation between the preference of information elements and the rationale behind this preference, antecedents mentioned in more than 10% of the provided explanations are highlighted.

For most information elements, respondents used explanations in which they referred to the concepts of the trustworthiness antecedent schema. Looking at the number of antecedents mentioned more frequently (>10% = shaded table cells) as a rationale for information preferences, for all information elements at least two antecedents per information element are mentioned more frequently compared to others, although they refer to different antecedents. For example, for the information element 'personality traits', respondents mention 7 antecedents in more then 10% of their explanations as a rationale, namely caring, commitment, competence, consistency, openness, persistence and receptivity (next to a relatively large number of various additional antecedents). This indicates that respondents generally expect the information element 'Personality traits/character' to contain useful information to assess professional trustworthiness on several antecedents. Two of these antecedents, namely 'caring' and 'receptivity' were not mentioned frequently in other explanations of information element preferences, indicating this information element can also function as a 'rare', although not unique (in the sense of a 1-to-1 relation), cue for a property. Only for the information element 'photo' (nr. 10) no clear relationship with any trustworthiness antecedent was obtained. Several antecedents were not at all mentioned as a rationale in the explanations of the 15 most commonly preferred information elements, respectively discreteness, fairness and loyalty.

[INSERT TABLE 4 'Code frequencies expressed as percentages of the number of obtained explanations' ABOUT HERE]

4. Conclusion and discussion

Results indicate that trustors value information elements that may reveal information that corresponds to multiple properties of a trustworthy person (as represented in the trustworthiness antecedent schema) most. Although each trustor in principle uses various and often different information elements to assess the professional trustworthiness of colleagues, there is quite some overlap in information element preferences as well as their underlying rationale.

Participants seem to select information elements that provide multiple cues for multiple antecedents. We could not find proof for the hypothesis of the uniqueness of information elements as cues; indeed, most information elements functioned as cue to more than one trustworthiness antecedent. This could be an indication of an 'information efficiency' strategy of trustors, resulting in their preference of elements that provide cues for more than one trustworthiness antecedents. Conversely, some patterns between information elements and antecedents could also be identified. For example, there seem to be strong relations between each of the information elements 'work experience', 'education', 'age', 'language skills', 'occupation/function/role/job' and the antecedent 'competence' in comparison to the other information elements and antecedents. Likewise, stronger relations can be seen between the elements 'personal motivation', 'ideas in relation with a project' and the antecedent 'commitment'. Results also reveal that not all information preferences can be explained with the cognitive schema of trustworthiness: some information elements, such as a photo, seem to be selected because they provide trustors with a certain 'feel' for a trustee. These explanations were principally coded as PERI, a code which refers to an intuitive and affective impression that contributes to the trust formation process.

Another interesting result is that often-used information elements, such as 'name', hardly seem to matter for professional trustworthiness assessments. Information elements most likely fulfill different functions and this element may merely function as an identity or reference tag, to distinguish between and to address people ('the flag on the ship'). Apparently, it does not carry weight in a trustworthiness assessment, although it can fulfill other functions. Rusman et al. (2011) identified information elements that were both identified as practical as well as relevant for professional trustworthiness assessments, such as 'availability during project'

and 'language and language proficiency'. Another possibility is that people unconsciously consider some information as something that is 'known', as in Aranda's et al. (2010) classification, and therefore are disregarded as being influential for their judgment.

When looking at the overall TWAN schema (Appendix A), especially the antecedents of competence, commitment, responsibility, availability and communality were most often referred to as rationales in the provided explanations. However, in contrast with the expectance, respondents did not refer to all antecedents of the TWAN model: Discreteness, fairness and loyalty and sharing were not mentioned at all in the explanations provided with the top 15 most preferred information elements. This could be a result of the focus on the initial phase of trust formation, in which some antecedents can be assessed more easily then others. It might also indicate that some antecedents are emphasized more than others, depending on the collaborative stage, when assessing professional trustworthiness.

In summary, practical implications of this study are twofold. First, insight in the rational behind information preferences can guide the design of artefacts to become acquainted and to inform trustworthiness assessments in virtual teams, such as profiles. Second, the coding scheme could also function as an analysis framework for interpersonal trust related problems in teams. Further research is needed to verify whether the scheme can indeed fulfill this function. Future research should also target the further analysis of the qualitative data from the perspective of the other coding categories included in Appendix A, such as the characteristics of the trust-requiring situation, routes through which information is acquired and the different trust manifestations, to gain further insight in the professional interpersonal trust construct, from a 'state' as well as a 'process' perspective.

Appendix A - Coding Scheme Interpersonal Trust Formation

1. Antecedents of cognitive schema of professional trustworthiness (AT)

1.1 Communality (COM): Personal characteristics which the trustor has in common with the trustee. This can be any shared characteristic, like a similar goal they want to achieve, shared language use, common identity characteristics or shared values. Even trivial ones, like a shared hobby or the same type of pet they have, can contribute to this category.	
1.2 Ability (ABIL): Capability of a trustee, determined by knowledge, skills and competences, which enables to perform tasks within some specific domain. Includes the extent to which a person seems:	
knowledge (KNOW)	To recall facts, concepts, principles and procedures within certain domains
skills (SKIL)	to have acquired a proficiency in the execution of operations to achieve a certain goal state
competence (COMP)	capable to act properly and with a good result while solving problems in a complex, real-life environment, using and integrating ones personal characteristics, experience, knowledge, and skills
1.3 Benevolence (BEN): The perceived level of courtesy and positive attitude a trustee displays towards the trustor. Includes the extent to which a person seems:	
willingness to help (HELP)	to give support in situations in which it is needed
availability (AV)	approachable and reachable for another person
sharing (SHA)	not to keep (re) sources to him/herself and to give access to them to other people
Faith in intentions (FI)	to act in another person's interest and does not exploit this person when vulnerable
receptivity (REC)	interested in another person's ideas and feelings, listen to them and take them into account while acting
friendliness (FRI)	Friendly and easy to get along with
openness (OPEN)	to reveal oneself, in terms of personality and thoughts, to another person
caring (CA)	concerned about other people interests
commitment (COMIT)	dedicated to,motivated for and engaged with something
1.4 Internalized norms (INTNO): The intrinsic moral norms a trustee guards his actions with. These differ from benevolence in that they are directed towards others in general, rather than toward a specific trustor. Includes the extent to which a person seems:	
integrity (INT)	sincere and cannot be corrupted, to be true to ones personal norms and values
discretion (DISC)	to keep sensitive information confidential
honesty (HON)	not to mislead or lie to others
fairness (FAIR)	to treat people equal
loyalty (LOY)	to respect and to be true to another person

1.5 Accountability (ACC): The degree to which a person is liable and accountable for his/her acts and meets expectations of another person. Includes the extent to which a person seems:	
reliability (REL)	to follow up on any appointments and commitments made and shows adequate judgment to act in encountered situations
consistency (CONS)	to display consistent character traits and predictable behaviour
persistence (PER)	stable in formed intentions to complete a task, independent of difficulties encountered
responsibility (RES)	to accept part of the work load and uses his/her ability to accomplish a task
1.6 Other antecedent (OTHA): Any other antecedent of trustworthiness mentioned by a respondent, for example 'initiative'	

Acknowledgements.

We would like to thank the Ghent University students for their dedicated collaboration.

References

Aranda, A., Vizcaíno, A., Palácio, R. & Morán, A. (2010). *What information would you like to know about your co-worker? A case study*. Paper presented at the 5th International Conference on Global Software Development (*ICGSE'10*), 23-26 August 2010. New Yersey. USA.

Arnold, J., Cooper, C.L., & Robertson, I.T. (1998). *Work psychology. Understanding human behaviour in the workplace.* Essex: Financial Times Professional Limited.

Berlanga, A. J., Bitter-Rijpkema, M. E., Brouns, F., Sloep, P. B., & Fetter, S. (2011). Personal profiles: Enhancing Social Interaction in Learning Networks. *International Journal of Web Based Communities,* vol. 7, no. 1., pp. 77-82.

Castelfranchi, C., & Falcone, R. (2010). Chapter 2. Socio-Cognitive Model of Trust: Basic Ingredients. In C. Castelfranchi & R. Falcone, *Trust Theory. A Socio-Cognitive and Computational Model* (pp.35-94). Chichester: Wiley & Sons.

Chopra, K., & Wallace, W. A. (2002). *Trust in electronic environments*. Paper presented at the HICSS 03, Hawaii.

Corbitt, G., Gardiner; L., & Wright, L. (2004). *A comparison of team developmental stages, trust and performance for virtual versus face-to-face teams*. Paper presented at the 37th Hawaii International Conference on System Sciences, Hawaii.

Donath, J. (2006). *Signals, cues and meaning.* Unpublished manuscript. Retrieved August, 2006, from http://smg.media.mit.edu/classes/IdentitySignals06/SignalingDraft.pdf

Donath, J. (2007). Signals in social supernets. *JCMC*, vol. 13, no. 1, article 12

Dourish, P., & Belotti, V. (1992). Awareness and Coordination in Shared Workspaces. *Proceedings of the conference on computer supported cooperative work (CSCW)* (pp. 107–114). Toronto, Canada: ACM.

Feng, J., Lazar, J., Preece, J. (2004). Empathy and online interpersonal trust: a fragile relationship. *Behaviour and Information Technology,* vol. 23, no. 2, pp. 97–106.

Fleiss, J. L. (1981) *Statistical methods for rates and proportions*. New York: John Wiley.

Gambetta, D. (1988). *Trust: making and breaking cooperative relations*. Oxford: Basil Blackwell.

Gutwin, C., & Greenberg, S. (1998). Design for individuals, design for groups: tradeoffs between power and workspace awareness. *Proceedings of the conference on computer supported cooperative work (CSCW)* (pp. 207–216). Seattle, Washington, United States: ACM.

Gutwin, C., & Greenberg, S. (1999). The effects of workspace awareness support on the usability of real-time distributed groupware. *ACM Transactions on Computer-Human Interaction,* vol. 6, no. 3, pp. 243–281.

Gutwin, C., & Greenberg, S. (2001). *The importance of awareness for team cognition in distributed collaboration.* Report 2001-696-19, Dept Computer Science, University of Calgary, Alberta, CANADA. www.cpsc.ucalgary.ca/grouplab/papers/

Gutwin, C., & Greenberg, S. (2002). A descriptive framework of workspace awareness for real-time groupware. *Computer Supported Cooperative Work,* vol. 11, pp. 411–446.

Häkkinen, P. (2004). What makes learning and understanding in virtual teams so difficult? *Cyber Psychology & Behavior,* vol. 7, no. 2, pp. 201-206.

Hancock, J. T., & Dunham, P. J. (2001). Impression Formation in Computer-Mediated Communication Revisited. *Communication research,* vol. 28, no. 3, pp. 325-347.

Hardin, R. (2002). *Trust and trustworthiness.* New York: Russell Sage Foundation.

Hung, Y. C., Dennis, A.R, & Robert, L. (2004). *Trust in Virtual Teams: Towards an Integrative Model of Trust Formation.* Paper presented at the 37th Hawaii International Conference on System Sciences, Hawaii.

Jarvenpaa, S., & Leidner, D.(1998) Communication and trust in global virtual teams. *JCMC,* vol. 3, no.4.

Jarvenpaa, S., Knoll, K., & Leidner, D. (1998). Is Anybody Out There?: The Development of Trust in Virtual Teams. Journal of Management Information Systems, vol. 14, no. 4, pp. 29-64.

Kanawattanachai, P., & Yoo, Y. (2005). Dynamic nature of trust in virtual teams. *Sprouts: Working Papers on Information Environments, Systems and Organizations,* vol. 2, no. 2, pp. 41–58.

Kreijns, K. (2004). *Sociable CSCL environments. Social Affordances, Sociability and Social Presence* (Doctoral dissertation). Heerlen: Open Universiteit Nederland. Retrieved from http://www.ou.nl/Docs/Onderzoek/Promoties/2004/Dissertation_Karel_Kreijns_040510.pdf

Kreijns, K., & Kirschner, P.A. (2004). Designing Sociable CSCL Environments. Applying Interaction Design Principles. In J.W. Strijbos, P.A. Kirschner & R.L. Martens (Eds.). *What We Know about CSCL and Implementing it in Higher Education.* (pp.221-243). Dordrecht: Kluwer Academic Publishers.

Lea, M., & Spears, R. (1995). Love at first byte? Building personal relationships over computer networks. In J. T. Wood & S. Duck (Eds.), *Understudied Relationships: Off the Beaten Track* (pp. 197-236). Newbury Park: CA: Sage.

Liu, Y., & Ginther, D. (2001). Managing Impression Formation in Computer-Mediated Communication. *Educause Quarterly,* vol. 3, pp. 50-54.

Mayer, R. C., Davis, J. H., & Schoorman, D. (1995). An integrative model of organizational trust. *Academy of Management Review,* vol. 20, no.3, pp.709-734.

Miles, M.B., & Huberman, A.M. (1994). *An Expanded Sourcebook.Qualitative Data Analysis.* Thousand Oaks: Sage Publications.

Neuendorf, K. A.(2002). *The Content Analysis Guidebook*. Thousand Oaks: Sage Publications, Inc.

Raes, A.M.L., Heijltjes, M.G., Glunk, U., & Roe, A.R. (2006). *Conflict, trust, and effectiveness in teams performing complex tasks: a study of temporal patterns*. Retrieved September 2006 from http://arno.unimaas.nl/show.cgi?fid=4073S .

Riegelsberger, J., Sasse, M. A., & McCarthy, J. (2004). The mechanics of trust: a framework for research and design. *International Journal of Human-Computer Studies,* vol. *62*, no. 3, pp. 381-422.

Remidez, H., Stam, A., & Laffey, J.(2007). Web-Based Template-Driven Communication Support Systems: Using Shadow netWorkspace to Support Trust Development in Virtual Teams. *IJeC,* vol. 3, no.2, pp. 65-83.

Rousseau, D. M., Sitkin, S. B., Burt, R. S., & Camerer, C. (1998). "Not so different after all: a cross-discipline view of trust". *Academy of Management Review,* vol. 23, no. 3, pp. 393-404.

Rusman, E., Bruggen, v., J., Cörvers, R., Sloep, P., & Koper, R.(2009). From pattern to practice: Evaluation of a design pattern fostering trust in virtual teams. *Computers in Human Behaviour,* vol. 25, no. 5, pp. 1010-1019.

Rusman, E., Van Bruggen, J., Sloep, P., & Koper, R. (2010). Fostering trust in virtual project teams: Towards a design framework grounded in a TrustWorthiness Antecedents (TWAN) schema. *International Journal of Human Computer Studies*, vol. 68, no.11, pp. 834-850.

Rusman, E., Van Bruggen, J., Sloep, P., Valcke, M., & Koper, R. (2011) Can I Trust You? –Profile Elements that Inform First Impressions of Trustworthiness in Virtual Project Teams. *International Journal of Information Technology Project Management (IJITPM)*, vol. 2, no. 4.

Salmon, G. (2003). E-tivities: The key to active online learning. London: Kogan page.

Six, F., Nooteboom, B., & Hoogendoorn, A.(2010). Actions that Build Interpersonal Trust: A Relational Signalling Perspective. *Review of Social Economy,* vol. 68, no.3*,* pp. 285-315.

Ten Kate, S.(2009). *Trustworthiness within Social Networking Sites: A study on the intersection of HCI and Sociology* (Unpublished Business studies master's thesis). University of Amsterdam, Amsterdam.

Ulivieri, F. (2005). *Trust across disciplines*. T3Group - Trust: Theory and Technology. Rome: Institute of Cognitive Sciences and Technology.

Walther, J.B. (1995). Relational Aspects of Computer-Mediated Communication: Experimental Observations over Time. *Organization Science,* vol. *6,* no. 2, pp. 186–203.

Walther, J. B. (1996). Computer-mediated communication: Impersonal, interpersonal, and hyperpersonal interaction. *Communication Research,* vol. 23, pp. 3-43.

Walther, J.B. (2005). *The rules of virtual groups*. Paper presented at the 38th Hawaii International Conference on System Sciences, Big Island, HI, Hawaii.

Wilson, J. M., Straus, S. G., & McEvily, B. (2006). All in due time: The development of trust in computer-mediated and face-to-face teams. *Organizational Behavior & Human Decision Processes,* vol. 99, no. 1, pp. 16-33.

Zolin, R., Hinds, P.J., Fruchter, R., & Levitt, R.E. (2002). *Trust in Cross-functional, global teams.* Stanford: Center for Integrated Facility Engineering (CIFE), Stanford University. Retrieved April 2007 from http://cife.stanford.edu/online.publications/WP067.pdf

Zolin, R., Fruchter, R., & Hinds, P. (2003). Communication, Trust & Performance: The Influence of Trust on Performance in A/E/C Crossfunctional, Geographically Distributed Work. Stanford: Center for Integrated Facility Engineering (CIFE), Stanford University. Retrieved April 2007 from http://cife.stanford.edu/online.publications/WP078.pdf

Zolin, R., Hinds, P., Fruchter, R., & Levitt, R.E. (2004). Interpersonal trust in cross-functional, geographically distributed work: a longitudinal study. *Information and Organization,* vol. 14, no. 1, pp. 1–26.

Tables

Table 1. Example response

Preferred information element	**Facts which can be derived from this information element**	**Explanation of preference**
Personal motivation for project	Reason for participation; expectation(s) of project	You get to know whether you are on the same wavelength. Do you have the same expectations?

Table 2. The 15 most selected information elements and acquired explanations

Information element	**Frequency (times selected by respondents)**	**Codable explanations**
Personality traits/character	124	112
Work experience	118	108
Personal motivation for project	117	106
Education/studies/training/diplomas	94	84
Age/date of birth	87	78
Availability during project/agenda	82	76
Recommendations/references/reviews by third parties	74	62
Project work experience	67	59
Language/language proficiency/language skills	66	62
Photo (formal/informal)	65	64
Interests/hobbies	60	56
Family situation/marital status	54	50
Ideas in relation to project	49	39
Occupation/function/role/job	49	46
Nationality	47	43
TOTAL	1153	1045

Table 3. Example quotes

Antecedent	**Example quotes with adjoining information element**
Competence	"I will perceive someone with more work experience as more reliable as this person will probably do his job well when he could work for several years within a company and he will also, through experience, know more" (work experience)
	"An older person has more work experience and if he/she is selected to participate in the project he/she has proven to be reliable" (age/date of birth)
	"How well one can manage languages, positive or negative. It is important to master some languages to advance communication, especially in an international project" (language proficiency)
Commitment	"Number of professions someone had. Rising functions relative to their age. If someone works his way up, he will also spend more time and energy in the project, therefore you can count on this person" (work experience)
	"Why someone participates in a project. If someone participates involuntary, he/she will probably be less motivated than someone who participates voluntarily" (personal motivation)
Responsibility	"You will know whether someone will dedicate him/herself [to the project] and of what one is capable of. Someone who makes sincere choices is more reliable in accomplishing the task. Someone with ambition already proved that he/she is suitable." (personal motivation)
	"Someone older has usually more life and work experience. Therefore he/she can also take more responsibility and is autonomous" (age)

Table 4. Code frequencies expressed as percentages of the number of obtained explanations

Codes / Information elements	Availability	Caring	Communality	Commitment	Competence	Consistency	Discretion	Fairness	Faith in intentions	Friendliness	Willingness to help	Honesty	Integrity	Knowledge	Loyalty	Openness	Other Antecedent	Persistence	Receptivity	Reliability	Responsibility	Sharing	Skills
1. Personality traits/ character	4	11	8	27	15	10	0	0	2	7	1	6	5	0	0	13	69	10	10	4	5	0	1
2. Work experience	1	2	0	14	91	11	0	0	0	0	8	2	1	9	0	0	10	4	1	2	27	0	9
3. Personal motivation for project	12	1	6	92	8	1	0	0	2	0	0	0	7	0	0	0	4	13	0	5	34	0	0
4. Education/ studies/ training/ diplomas	1	0	1	27	88	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	23	0	0	0	6	0	0	35	0	4
5. Age/date of birth	0	0	22	3	73	5	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	5	0	1	3	0	0	6	2	0	0
6. Availability during project/ agenda	89	0	1	30	4	4	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	7	22	0	0
7. Recommen-dations/ references/ reviews by third parties	0	0	0	15	32	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	27	0	0
8. Project work experience	0	0	0	14	51	0	0	0	0	0	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	2	7	0	7
9. Language/ language proficiency/ language skills	2	0	8	11	81	0	0	0	0	0	3	0	0	5	0	0	5	0	0	0	8	0	45
10. Photo (formal/ informal)	0	0	2	2	2	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	5	5	0	0	0	0	0	0
11. Interests/ hobbies	13	9	21	34	11	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	2	7	0	0	0	21	2	0
12. Family situation/ marital status	36	2	4	10	12	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	0	0	4	8	0	0	0	10	0	0
13. Ideas in relation to project	0	0	21	54	33	0	0	0	0	0	3	0	0	3	0	3	15	0	3	0	10	3	8
14. Occupation/ function/role/ job	7	0	2	17	76	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	13	0	2	13	7	0	0	20	0	9
15. Nationality	19	2	28	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5	0	0	0	0	0	0